

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Lloyd Gary Logan, Jr., #65237,)	
)	Civil Action No. 6:09-1157-CMC-WMC
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>REPORT OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u>
)	
Detective James Carsto, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in cases filed under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983, and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

On January 13, 2010, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On January 15, 2010, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the plaintiff was advised of the summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. Despite this explanation, the plaintiff elected not to respond to the motion.

As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court filed a second order on February 24, 2010, giving the plaintiff through March 22, 2010, to file his response to the motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The plaintiff elected not to respond.

Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1084 (1990).

s/William M. Catoe
United States Magistrate Judge

March 31, 2010

Greenville, South Carolina